UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,532	06/25/2003	Michael Joseph Pizzo	13768.402	4133

47973   7590   03/23/2009
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER
ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2165	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 November 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,11,36-38 and 50-63* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9, 11, 36-38,& 50-63* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1.   In response to Applicant's amendment filed on 11/21/08, claims 1-9, 11, 36-38 and 50-63

remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 36-38, and 61-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Zondervan et al. (US 6,516,327 B1) in view of Jim Challenger, Arun Iyengar,

Paul Dantzig "A scalable system for Consistently Caching Dynamic Web Data", (from here on

referred as Challenger et al.) and further in view of Craig et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,757,708 B1).

        As per claims 1, and 36, Zondervan et al. is directed to a computer system that accesses a

database having one or more data tables, the computer system configured to provide content

from the database to a Web server for inclusion in Web based responses to requests for Web

based content, computer system including a cache configured to cache database content included

in Web based responses so as to provide more efficient access to the cached database content

when formulating subsequent Web based responses, a method for formulating a Web based

response in response to receiving a Web based request for database content, the method

comprising the following:

an act of determining whether a cache entry for Web based content requested by a request

for Web based content already exists in the cache (Inherent feature to caching); and

upon determining that the cache entry does not exist (Inherent feature to caching

operations which is also taught by referring to flags or status identifiers that check on whether

the data should be stored or not), performing the following:

an act of inserting a record for the selected data table into a change notification table, the

corresponding record including versioning information identifying and corresponding to the

selected data table, the versioning information retrievable by the Web server to determine when a

corresponding cache entry containing cacheable content from selected data table is invalid

(Zondervan et al., column 11, lines 34-50; column 12, lines 20-34);

an act of inserting a record for the selected data table into a change notification table, the

corresponding record including versioning information identifying and corresponding to the

selected data table, the versioning information retrievable by the Web server to determine when a

corresponding cache entry containing cacheable content from selected data table is invalid

(Zondervan et al., column 11, lines 34-50; column 12, lines 20-34)

the cache entry including the versioning information identifying and corresponding to the

selected data table (Zondervan et al., column 13, lines 2-16);

an act of querying the change notification table for versioning information identifying

and corresponding to the selected data table (Zondervan et al., column 14, lines 28-36);

an act of receiving current versioning information identifying and corresponding to the selected data table (Zondervan et al., column 11, lines 34-50; column 12, lines 20-34);

an act of comparing the cached versioning information to the current versioning information table (Zondervan et al., column 14, lines 28-36).

Zondervan et al. does not teach an act of selecting a data table that is to be monitored for content changes, the selected data table selected from among the one or more data tables of the database.

Challenger et al. teaches the act of selecting a data table that is to be monitored for content changes comprises an act of the computer system automatically selecting a data table in response to a received Web request (page 300, column 1 last paragraph, lines 4-8, wherein the system is aware of only "athlete page" being imputed hence that is table selected).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Zondervan et al. by teachings of Challenger et al. to include the act of selecting a data table that is to be monitored for content changes comprises an act of the computer system automatically selecting a data table in response to a received Web request because automation is more efficient use of resources (see Challenger et al. abstract).

Zondervan et al. as modified still does not does teach an act of assigning a trigger to the selected data table, the trigger configured to update the versioning information for the selected table in the change notification table when content in the selected data table is altered.

Challenger et al. does teach the act of assigning a trigger to the selected data table comprises an act of the computer system automatically assigning a trigger in response to

receiving a Web request for content contained in the selected data table (page 301, column 1, section "3.5 The Trigger Table").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to further modify Zondervan et al. as modified by teachings of Challenger et al. to include the act of assigning a trigger to the selected data table comprises an act of the computer system automatically assigning a trigger in response to receiving a Web request for content contained in the selected data table because automation is more efficient use of resources (see Challenger et al. abstract).

Zondervan et al. still does not teach an act of assigning a database cache dependency to at least a portion of the constructed Web response based on the commands executed during the construction of the Web response using a page file, wherein the page file defines at least one database and at least one table on which the database cache entry is dependent, and further defines the portion of the constructed Web response on which the cache dependency is dependent; and an act of caching at least a portion of the constructed Web response in a cache entry in the cache.

Challenger et al. teaches the pages are stored in various portions (tables) within the database and retrieved in response to requests (See page 295, section 2.1, and see page 298, section 3.1), and teaches database dependencies, more specifically the claimed limitation of:

an act of assigning a database cache dependency to at least a portion of the constructed Web response based on the commands executed during the construction of the Web response using a page file, wherein the page file defines at least one database and at least one table on which the database cache entry is dependent, and further defines the portion of the constructed

Web response on which the cache dependency is dependent (See page 295, section 2, and page 299, section 3.3); and

an act of caching at least a portion of the constructed Web response in a cache entry in the cache (See page 298, section 3.1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to further modify Zondervan et al. as modified by teachings of Challenger et al. to include the pages are stored in various portions (tables) within the database and retrieved in response to requests and caching is preformed in accordance with database dependences because it provides for cache consistency while providing up to date page or requested portions only results thus allowing for more efficient and faster response time while offering customization.

Zondervan et al. as modified still does not teach an act of caching interim results that can be used in the generation of a plurality of different Web responses in a cache entry in the cache, the interim results based on one or more records from the selected data table and one or more records form one or more other data tables;

an act receiving a Web based request for a Web based response that is to include the interim results subsequent to caching the interim results in the cache entry;

an act of determining how to access the interim results for inclusion in a Web based response based on the results of comparing the versioning information and in response to receiving the Web based request for the portion of content;

an act of accessing the interim results in accordance with the determination; and

an act constructing a Web based response responsive to the Web based request based on the interim results.

Craig et al. teaches an act of caching interim results that can be used in the generation of

a plurality of different Web responses in a cache entry in the cache, the interim results based on

one or more records from the selected data table and one or more records form one or more other

data tables (See Craig et al. Abstract);

an act receiving a Web based request for a Web based response that is to include the

interim results subsequent to caching the interim results in the cache entry (See Craig et al.

column 8, lines 45-57);

an act of determining how to access the interim results for inclusion in a Web based

response based on the results of comparing the versioning information and in response to

receiving the Web based request for the portion of content (See Craig et al. column 10, lines 12-

25, and see Craig et al. column 10, line 50-65, and see Craig et al. column 1, lines 20-42, prior

art);

an act of accessing the interim results in accordance with the determination (See Craig et

al. column 8, lines 45-54); and

an act constructing a Web based response responsive to the Web based request based on

the interim results (See Craig et al. column 9, lines 19-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

was made to further modify Zondervan et al. as modified by teachings of Craig et al. to include

storing interim results in cache, providing access methods to the results and constructing

response accordingly to Web requests since it provides for faster access in avoidance of re-

execution of information search and data gathering.

As per claim 2 <u>Zondervan et al.</u> as modified is directed to the act of selecting a data table that is to be monitored for content changes comprises an act of receiving user-input that causes the computer system to select a data table is to be monitored for content changes (See <u>Challenger et al.</u> page 295, section 2.1, column 2, "object ID" is "table ID", and see <u>Challenger et al.</u> page 300, column 1 last paragraph, lines 4-8, wherein the system is aware of only "athlete page" being imputed hence that is table selected).

As per claim 3 <u>Zondervan et al.</u> as modified teaches the act of selecting a data table that is to be monitored for content changes comprises an act of the computer system automatically selecting a data table in response to a received Web request (<u>Challenger et al.</u> page 300, column 1 last paragraph, lines 4-8, wherein the system is aware of only "athlete page" being imputed hence that is table selected).

As per claim 5 <u>Zondervan et al.</u> as modified teaches the act of inserting a record for the selected data table into a change notification table compromises an act of the computer system automatically inserting the record in response to a Web request (<u>Challenger et al.</u> page 301, column 1, lines 24-27; column 2, lines 9-10, wherein "inserting" means "adding")

As per claim 7 <u>Zondervan et al.</u> as modified is directed to the act of assigning a trigger to the selected data table comprises an act of receiving user input instructing a trigger to be assigned to the selected data table (<u>Challenger et al.</u> page 301, column 1, section "3.5 The Trigger Table").

As per claim 8 <u>Zondervan et al.</u> as modified teach the act of assigning a trigger to the selected data table comprises an act of the computer system automatically assigning a trigger in response to receiving a Web request for content contained in the selected data table (<u>Challenger et al.</u> page 301, column 1, section "3.5 The Trigger Table").

As per claim 9 <u>Zondervan et al.</u> as modified is directed to the act of assigning a trigger to the selected data table comprises an act of the assigning a trigger that, when executed by a processing unit at the computer system in response to content in the selected data table being altered, will update a corresponding change ID in the table change notification table (See <u>Challenger et al.</u> page 295, section 2.1, column 2, "object ID" is "table ID", and see <u>Challenger et al.</u> page 300, column 1 last paragraph, lines 4-8, wherein the system is aware of only "athlete page" being imputed hence that is table selected).

As per claim 11 <u>Zondervan et al.</u> as modified is directed to the act of sending the updated versioning information to the Web server comprises an act of sending updated versioning information that indicates to the Web server that the cache is to be invalidated (See <u>Craig et al.</u> column 10, lines 10-21).

As per claim 37 <u>Zondervan et al.</u> as modified is directed to the one or more computer-readable storage media are physical media (See <u>Craig et al.</u> Figure 1, 28, 30).

As per claim 38 Zondervan et al. as modified is directed to the one or more computer-readable storage media include system memory (See Craig et al. Figure 1, 28, 30).

Claims 61-63, are directed to version management by removing and update records and tables and it falls under the same teachings as those of Craig et al. column 10, lines 10-21.

4.   Claims 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zondervan et al. (US 6,516,327 B1) in view of Jim Challenger, Arun Iyengar, Paul Dantzig "A scalable system for Consistently Caching Dynamic Web Data", (from here on referred as Challenger et al.), and in view of Craig et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,757,708 B1) and further in view of Dettinger et al. (US PUB 2003/0093413 A1).

As per claims 4, and 6 Zondervan et al. as modified still does not teach the act of inserting a record for the selected data table into a change notification table compromises an act of inserting the record into a SQL table.

Dettinger et al. does teach the act of inserting a record for the selected data table into a change notification table compromises an act of inserting the record into a SQL table (Dettinger et al. page 4, paragraph 0036, lines 11-13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to further modify Zondervan et al. as modified by teachings of Dettinger et al. to include inserting a record into a SQL table because SQL language is most commonly used in databases.

5.   Claims 50-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zondervan

et al. (US 6,516,327 B1) in view of Jim Challenger, Arun Iyengar, Paul Dantzig "A scalable

system for Consistently Caching Dynamic Web Data", (from here on referred as Challenger et

al.), and in view of Craig et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,757,708 B1), and further in view of Shaul Dar,

Michael J. Franklin, Björn T. Jónsson, Divesh Srivastava, Michael Tan "Semantic Data Caching

and Replacement" (from here on referred as Dar et al.)

        As per claim 50 Zondervan et al. as modified teaches interim results (See Craig et al.

abstract) but still does not teach wherein the act of determining how to access the interim results

comprises an act of determining that interim results are to be reconstructed from the one or more

records in the selected data table and the one or more records in the one or more other data

tables.

        Dar et al. does teach wherein the act of determining how to access the interim results

comprises an act of determining that interim results are to be reconstructed from the one or more

records in the selected data table and the one or more records in the one or more other data tables

(Dar et al., section 2.4, 3rd paragraph).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

was made to further modify Zondervan et al. as modified by teachings of Dar et al. to include

wherein the act of determining how to access the interim results comprises an act of determining

that interim results are to be reconstructed from the one or more records in the selected data table

and the one or more records in the one or more other data tables because cache is a small, rapid

retrieval memory that cannot hold large sets of data therefore the remaining portion remains on disk (Dar et al., section 1.3, lines 5-8).

As per claim 51 Zondervan et al. as modified is directed to a n act of invalidating the cache entry that includes the interim results based on the comparison of version information in response to receiving the Web based request for the portion of content (Zondervan et al. figure 11, #218; column 14, lines 18-22).

As per claim 52 Zondervan et al. as modified still does not teach wherein the act of determining how to access the interim results with the determination comprises an act of determining that the interim results are to be retrieved from the cache entry.

Dar et al. does teach wherein the act of determining how to access the interim results with the determination comprises an act of determining that the interim results are to be retrieved from the cache entry (Dar et al., section 2.4, 3rd paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to further modify Zondervan et al. as modified by teachings of Dar et al. to include wherein act of determining how to access the interim results with the determination comprises an act of determining that the interim results are to be retrieved from the cache entry because cache is a small, rapid retrieval memory that cannot hold large sets of data therefore the remaining portion remains on disk (Dar et al., section 1.3, lines 5-8).

As per claim 53 <u>Zondervan et al.</u> as modified still does not teach wherein the act of accessing the interim results in accordance with the determination comprises an act of reconstructing the interim results from one or more records in the selected data table and the one or more records in the one or more other data tables not withstanding that interim results where cached at the computer system when the Web based request was received.

<u>Dar et al.</u> does teach wherein the act of accessing the interim results in accordance with the determination comprises an act of reconstructing the interim results from one or more records in the selected data table and the one or more records in the one or more other data tables not withstanding that interim results where(I think its suppose to be "were") cached at the computer system when the Web based request was received (<u>Dar et al.</u>, section 2.4, 3rd paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to further modify <u>Zondervan et al.</u> as modified by teachings of <u>Dar et al.</u> to include wherein the act of accessing the interim results in accordance with the determination comprises an act of reconstructing the interim results from one or more records in the selected data table and the one or more records in the one or more other data tables not withstanding that interim results where(I think its suppose to be "were") cached at the computer system when the Web based request was received because cache is a small, rapid retrieval memory that cannot hold large sets of data therefore the remaining portion remains on disk (<u>Dar et al.</u>, section 1.3, lines 5-8).

As per claim 54 <u>Zondervan et al.</u> as modified is directed to wherein the act of constructing a Web based response responsive to the Web based request based on the interim

results comprises including the reconstructed interim results in the Web based response not

withstanding that the interim results were cached at the computer system when the Web based

request for the portion of content was received (Dar et al., section 2.4, 3rd paragraph).

As per claim 55 Zondervan et al. as modified is directed to wherein computer executable

instructions that, when executed, cause the computer system to determine how to access the

interim results comprise computer executable instructions that, when executed, cause the

computer system to determine that the interim results to be reconstructed from the one or more

records in the selected data table and the one or more records in the one or more other data tables

(Dar et al., section 2.4, 3rd paragraph).

As per claim 56 Zondervan et al. as modified is directed to further comprising:

computer executable instructions that, when executed, cause the computer system to invalidate

the cache entry that includes the interim results based on the comparison of version information

in response to receiving the Web based request for the portion of content (See Craig et al.

abstract).

As per claim 57 Zondervan et al. as modified is directed to wherein computer executable

instructions that, when executed, cause the computer system to determine how to access the

interim results comprise computer executable instructions that, when executed, cause the

computer system to an act of determine that the interim results to be retrieved from the cache

entry (Dar et al., section 2.4, 3rd paragraph).

As per claim 58 <u>Zondervan et al.</u> as modified is directed to wherein computer executable instructions that, when executed, cause the computer system to access the interim results in accordance with the determination comprise computer executable instructions that, when executed, cause the computer system to reconstruct the interim results from one or more records selected database table not withstanding that the interim results were cached at the computer system when the Web based request was received (<u>Dar et al.</u>, section 2.4, 3rd paragraph).

As per claim 59 <u>Zondervan et al.</u> as modified is directed to wherein computer executable instructions that, when executed, cause the computer system to construct a Web based response based on the interim results comprise computer executable instructions that, when executed, cause the computer system to include a portion of content from the selected database table in the Web based response not withstanding that the interim results were cached at the computer system when the Web based request for was received (<u>Dar et al.</u>, section 2.4, 3rd paragraph).

6.   Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Zondervan et al.</u> (US 6,516,327 B1) in view of Jim Challenger, Arun Iyengar, Paul Dantzig "A scalable system for Consistently Caching Dynamic Web Data", (from here on referred as <u>Challenger et al.</u>) and further in view of <u>Craig et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,757,708 B1), and further in view of <u>Jacobs et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,732,237 B1).

As per claim 60, <u>Zondervan et al.</u> is directed to in a computer system that accesses a database having one or more data tables, the computer system configured to provide content from the database to a Web server for inclusion in Web based responses to requests for Web based content, the computer system including a cache configured to cache database content included in Web based responses so as to provide more efficient access to the cached database content when formulating subsequent Web based responses, a method for invalidating a cache entry when changes are detected in a data table, the method comprising the following:

an act of selecting a data table that is to be monitored for content changes, the selected data table selected from among the one or more data tables of the database (See corresponding rejection for claim, 1 above);

an act of inserting a record for the selected data table into a separate change notification table, the record including versioning information identifying and corresponding to the selected data table, the versioning information retrievable by the Web server to determine when a corresponding cache entry containing cacheable content from the selected data table is invalid (See corresponding rejection for claim, 1 above);

an act of attaching a trigger to the selected data table, the trigger configured to update the versioning information for the selected table in the change notification table when any record in the selected data table is altered regardless of the mechanism used to alter the record (See corresponding rejection for claim, 1 above);

an act of constructing interim results from a collection of records, including a plurality of records in the selected data table and one or more records form one or more other data tables, the

interim results usable in the generation of a plurality of different Web responses (See

corresponding rejection for claim, 1 above);

an act of caching the interim results in a cache entry in the cache, the cache entry

including the versioning information identifying and corresponding to the selected data table

(See corresponding rejection for claim, 1 above);

an act of a cache interface module issuing a querying to the change notification table for

versioning information identifying and corresponding to the selected data table (See Craig et al.

column 14, lines 20-27);

an act of detecting a change to a record in the selected data table, subsequent to issuing

the blocking query (See Challenger et al. page 301, column 2, section3.5.1, wherein

synchronization maintains up-to- date version information);

an act of the assigned trigger updating the versioning information for the selected table in

the change notification table, subsequent to issuing the blocking query (Challenger et al. page

301, column 2, section3.5.1);

an act of comparing the cached versioning information to the updated versioning

information (See corresponding rejection for claim, 1 above); and

an act of invalidating the cache entry for the interim results based on the results of the

comparison (See corresponding rejection for claim, 1 above).

The motivation to combine the references are similar to those of claim 1 since claim 60

contains similar recitations.

The combined references disclose the claimed invention but not specific to locking

mechanism preformed in caching systems. Specially the claimed:

the blocking query waiting until versioning information for the selected table is updated

before returning the versioning information fro the selected data table;

an act of the cache interface module receiving the updated versioning information in

response to the blocking query.

While, Craig is directed to version management and issues API calls for communicating

with an intermediary while waiting for updates (see column 8, lines 7-20).

Challenger et al. teaches the trigger (SQL query) based sequence halt until versioning

information for the selected table is updated before returning the request (See page 301, section

3.4).

Jacobs et al. is introduced to teach suspended requests until all updates are received (See

column 7, lines 36-44)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

was made to further modify Zondervan et al. as modified by teachings of Jacobs et al. to include

suspended requests waiting for cache updates to maintain version management because it

provides for cache consistency and coherency of multiple views.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

See OA citations above for newly applied prior art (new citations from existing

reference) to the amended features. Kanaley reference in claim 60 was removed.

Conclusion

8.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. For complete list of cited relevant art, see PTO-form 892.

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 571-272-4074.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Christian P. Chace can be reached on 571-272-4190. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Neveen Abel-Jalil
Primary Examiner
March 16, 2009
/Neveen Abel-Jalil/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2165